

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 30 2004****OFFICIAL**

In re the application of

Inventor: Martin
Serial No.: 09/823,938
Filing Date: March 30, 2001
for TELECOMMUNICATIONS
PORTAL CAPABLE OF
INTERPRETING MESSAGES
FROM AN EXTERNAL
DEVICE

Examiner: Knowlin, T

GAU: 2642

TELEFAX: 703-872-9306

Atty Docket: 102374-17

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or facsimile (at the Telefax Number above) transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Date

7/30/04

David J. Powsner Reg. No. 31,868

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Reply to Office Action

This is filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 30, 2003, rejecting the claims as allegedly anticipated by Chang, US 5,958,016. For the reasons below, that publication is not believed to detract from patentability of the claimed invention.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a telecommunication system having a processing module that communicates with an external communication device (for example, a switch) to receive message fragments and assemble events therefrom. The processing module includes a message handling object that receives the message fragments and discerns events (such as a call control event) from them. A dispatcher, that communicates with the message handling object, identifies and invokes a selected processes for processing those events. The processes effect execution of at least one task (e.g., an operation) to provide a communication service identified by the message.

Page 3

Independent claim 13 generally parallels claim 1, reciting that the dispatcher invokes at least one process that dynamically binds to a processing context which defines an action to be executed in response to an event in order to provide the requisite communication service identified by the message associated with that event.

Independent claim 15 recites a telecommunications system generally as above wherein the message handling object forms a message associated with an event communicated thereto by a processing context (also executing within the system) and transmits that message to the communication device. The message handling object discerns events and forms messages associated therewith from selected ones of a plurality of message fragments received from the device. The dispatcher exchanges events and their associated messages between selected processing contexts and the message handling object to effectuate activation of selected communications services defined by the messages.

The remaining independent claims are directed to methods generally paralleling the foregoing, reciting further or different limitations thereon.

The sole cited reference, Chang, is understood to provide little disclosure relevant to the pending claims. Although Chang does pertain to telecommunications devices, nowhere is it understood to teach the use of message handling objects to discern messages from fragments received from external devices. Nothing contained in the passages recited by the Examiner, to wit, col. 2, lines 7-29; col. 5, lines 3-15; col. 6, lines 4-14; col. 8, lines 40-63; col. 10, lines 19-49; and col. 14, lines 16-19, appear to discuss this. Indeed, a review of those passages, as well as a search of the document as a whole, fails to uncover any treatment of the processing of message fragments — much less, the discerning of events or construction of whole messages therefrom.

Nor does Chang appear to teach or suggest the use of a dispatcher to invokes processes to process events discerned from fragments, to dynamically bind a processing context to a communication services, and/or to exchange events and messages between context. Specifically, no discussion of such appears in the passages cited by the Examiner (enumerated above), nor is such otherwise evident upon review of the document.

Page 4

For these reasons, among others, Chang does not anticipate, render obvious or otherwise detract from patentability of the claimed invention. The Applicant therefor respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,
NUTTER, McLENNEN & FISH, LLP

 7/30/04

David J. Powsner
Reg. No. 31,868

Attorney for Applicant
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02110-2604
Tel: (617)439-2717
Fax: (617)310-9717